

REFERENCE TO THE

SUGAR RATES MAY BE RESTORED

BY MEMPHIS MEETING.

BOYCOTT ON THE GULF ROUTE.

FOUR ROADS TO WITHDRAW

FREIGHT DIVISIONS WITH IT.

General Manager Gillham Says South-

western Lines are Forming a

Pool to Fight the Pittsburg

& Gulf-May Appeal to

the Courts.

General Freight Agent John A. Sargent

of the Pittsburg & Gulf, said yesterday

in regard to the conference to be held

today at Memphis to consider sugar

rates from New Orleans to Kansas City

and Omaha, that the Pittsburg & Gulf

will not attend the meeting. Mr.

Sargent will not attend the meeting. He

left last night for Quincy and will go to

Chicago to-night to arrange for the es-

tablishment of a Pittsburg & Gulf office

there. The Gulf road will be represented

at Memphis to-day by R. W. Lightburne,

general agent at New Orleans. Mr. Sar-

gent said he expected the matter of the

sugar rate adjustment would be left to

the hands of the Kansas City board of

trade. Neither the Pittsburg & Gulf

nor the Memphis is an initial New

Orleans line.

It was reported several days ago that

the Illinois Central had protested against

the Memphis rate of 27 cents to Kansas

City, claiming it was a warehouseman's

rate. The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

The Illinois Central is now in the

hands of the Memphis board of trade.

FREE STORAGE CASE.

Interstate Commission Renders a

Decision Adverse to the

Railroads.

Washington, Feb. 9.—The Interstate

commerce commission to-day, in an opinion

by Commissioner Yeaman, announced its

decision in the case brought by the Amer-

ican Warehousemen's Association against the

Illinois Central Railroad Company and

other carriers, known as the "free

storage case."

It holds that a common carrier with no

general warehouse facilities which are not

essential to its business as a carrier, with

out furnishing them for all shippers at all

times and under the same terms, and not

to continue to do so, is not a warehouseman

within the meaning of the act. The com-

missioner held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

sioner also held that the Illinois Central

was not a warehouseman, and that the

warehousemen's association was not en-

titled to the relief sought. The commis-

RIOT AT TRIAL.

TWO HUNDRED LAWYERS RAISE A

ROW OUTSIDE.

HAVE A FIGHT WITH GUARDS.

JUDGE ORDERS COURT CLEARED TO

QUELL A TUMULT.

Mme. Dreyfus to Be Permitted to Testify—

Several Former Cabinet

Ministers on the Witness

Stand—M. Zola Almost

Unnoticed.

Paris, Feb. 9.—In spite of special precau-

tions, there was a repetition of the scenes

yesterday when the trial of

Emile Zola and Perleux, who are being

prosecuted by the government for de-

nouncing the Esterhazy court-martial, was

continued to-day in the assizes court of the

Seine.

Over 200 barristers in their robes gath-

ered at the public entrance and indulged in

horse-play. When the presiding judge or-

dered them not to obstruct the passage,

the barristers rushed to the guard rails

and struck them. One of the young lawyers

was arrested, but after quiet had been re-

stored he was released.

General Hoin de Feyre refused emphat-

ically to testify, under the plea of profes-

sional and state secrecy. M. Delequerre,

the presiding judge, consented that Mad-

ame Dreyfus should be allowed to testify,

on the condition that her evidence be re-

stricted to Esterhazy case.

General Laborie protested against the lim-

itation of the evidence, and the president

denounced the scenes in court, the

barristers in the newspapers and the

attacks on his client as being unworthy

of France.

General Hoin de Feyre, replying, admitted

that he was a minister for before he had

testified at the Esterhazy court-martial, he

had received from Major Esterhazy a cer-

tain document which concerned the Drey-

fus case, but he refused to give any fur-

ther particulars, on the ground of profes-

sional secrecy.

The general admitted that Colonel Pic-

quart had been transferred to Tunis owing

to his being a witness in the case, and

witness added that he personally was con-

vinced of the guilt of Dreyfus, while other

witnesses, before the general, admitted

which had come to his knowledge, made

a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

was a general confession of guilt. This statement

FORCED TO ACCEPT A CHECK.

L. E. Smith, of Salem, Mass., the Vic-

tim of a Similarity of

Names.

Salem, Mass., Feb. 9.—L. E. Smith, of this

city, is embarrassed by having a check for

\$100 forced on him. It all results from a

similarity of names. Some days ago Mr.

Smith, who is connected with the Western

Union, was called to a dinner party at the

home of a friend. He was seated at a table

with John H. Stetson, town treasurer of

Weymouth. He wrote to Mr. Stetson about

the check, and Mr. Stetson, who was sitting

next to him, said he would take care of it.

Mr. Smith thought he had a right to

open letters addressed to himself, and so

informed Mr. Stetson. Mr. Stetson

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith

wrote again denying it, and Mr. Smith